



17w

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of: **YAJIMA, Taro, et al.**

Group Art Unit: **1753**

Serial No.: **10/657,192**

Examiner: **Steven H. VERSTEEG**

Filed: **September 9, 2003**

P.T.O. Confirmation No.: **1622**

For: **MATCHING BOX, VACUUM APPARATUS USING THE SAME, AND
VACUUM PROCESSING METHOD**

**RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF
NON-COMPLIANT AMENDMENT**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

August 19, 2005

Sir:

This is a Response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment dated August 4, 2005. The Notice addresses the explanatory drawings labeled Fig. a and Fig. b, attached to the Amendment filed July 26, 2005. It is believed that this Response is fully responsive to the Notice dated August 4, 2005.

It is submitted that the drawings (labeled Fig. a and Fig. b) submitted along with the Amendment filed on July 26, 2005 were not intended to be part of the drawing Figures 1, 2, 3a, 3b, 4, 5 or 6 already existing in the file. The Fig. a and Fig. b, filed with the July 26, 2005 Amendment, were merely intended to be explanatory drawings in support of the arguments against the cited prior art, as clearly explained in the Remarks portion of the July 26, 2005 Amendment. More particularly, Fig. a and Fig. b are mere schematic circuit diagrams to explain the differences between the applicants' claimed invention and the cited prior art, as explained on pages 16 - 19 of the Remarks portion of the Amendment filed July 26, 2005.